

**Appn No. 09/851,722**  
**Amdt date February 28, 2005**  
**Reply to Office action of November 30, 2004**

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1, 11, 14, and 16 are amended. New claims 17-20 are added.

Claims 1-7 and 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Allen (US 6,584,096 B1), and claim 8 is rejected 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Allen. In view of the above amendments and following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, therefore, reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Amended independent claim 1 includes, among other limitations, "the gateway receives a packet payload and determines if the received packet payload is voice packet or data packet, if the received packet payload is a voice packet, the gateway further determines if the voice packet is destined for a telephone or the network, if the voice packet is destined for the telephone, the gateway depacketizes the voice packet and transmits the depacketized voice packet to the telephone, if the voice packet is destined for the network, the gateway reformats the voice packet and transmits the reformatted voice packet to the network;" amended claim 11 includes, among other limitations, "determining if the received packet payload is voice packet or data packet; if the received packet payload is a voice packet, further determining if the voice packet is destined for a telephone or a second network having a plurality of media adapter terminals; depacketizing the voice packet and transmitting the depacketized voice packet over a phone line to the telephone if the voice packet is destined for the telephone;

**Appn No. 09/851,722**  
**Amdt date February 28, 2005**  
**Reply to Office action of November 30, 2004**

and reformatting the voice packet and transmitting the reformatted voice packet over the phone line to the second network, if the voice packet is destined for the network." Allen does not teach nor does it suggest the above limitations.

Rather, Allen describes an apparatus for connecting a home network to the Internet using the ports or sockets of the home gateway to multiplex the data flow. (Abstract). With respect to telephony devices, Allen describes in FIG. 10 that "every IP phone in the houses uses IPRP to autodiscover the public Internet address for the home (step 50), and registers interest in a port associated with IP telephony (step 52). Incoming data traffic to the home Internet address/IP telephony port is multicast within the home to all the IP telephones (step 54)." (Col. Lines 24-29, and FIG. 10).

There is no teaching or suggestion in Allen about "determining if the received packet payload is voice packet or data packet," "if the received packet payload is a voice packet, further determining if the voice packet is destined for a telephone or a second network having a plurality of media adapter terminals," "depacketizing the voice packet and transmitting the depacketized voice packet over a phone line to the telephone," and "reformatting the voice packet and transmitting the reformatted voice packet over the phone line to the second network, if the voice packet is destined for the network," as recited in amended claim 11. Consequently, the amended claim 11 is not anticipated by Allen.

**Appln No. 09/851,722  
Amdt date February 28, 2005  
Reply to Office action of November 30, 2004**

Amended claim 1 and new claim 17 include similar limitations. Therefore, claims 1 and 17 are not anticipated by Allen.

In short, independent claims 1, 11 and 17 define a novel and unobvious invention over the cited references. Dependent claims 2-10, 12-16, and 18-20 are all dependent, directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 11 and 17, respectively, and therefore include all the limitations of their base claims and additional limitations therein. Accordingly, these claims are also allowable for the same reason set forth hereinbefore as well as the additional limitations recited.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance, and accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By

  
Raymond R. Tabandeh  
Reg. No. 43,945  
626/795-9900

RRT/mee  
MEE PAS610393.1--02/28/05 3:13 PM